

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
09/966,054	09/28/2001	Fernando A. Mujica	TI-32182 4360			
7590 12/28/2004			EXAMINER			
Dennis Moore			JOSEPH, JAISON			
Texas Instrume P.O. Box 65547	nts Incorporated 74, M/S 3999	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
Dallas, TX 75	- ·	2634				
				DATE MAILED: 12/28/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary		Application	tion No. Applicant(s)					
		09/966,05	54	MUJICA, FERNANDO A.				
		Examiner		Art Unit				
		Jaison Jos	seph	2634				
 Period for	The MAILING DATE of this communication Reply	n appears on the	cover sheet with the	correspondence ad	dress			
THE M Extensi after SI If the pe - If NO pe - Failure Any rep	RTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR R AILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION ONE of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CI X (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication eriod for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, eriod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory p to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by only received by the Office later than three months after the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON. FR 1.136(a). In no evo on. a reply within the state period will apply and wi statute, cause the app	ent, however, may a reply be ti utory minimum of thirty (30) day Il expire SIX (6) MONTHS from ication to become ABANDONE	mely filed ys will be considered time n the mailing date of this o ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status								
1) 🔯 F	1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>28 September 2001</u> .							
2a) <u></u> ⊤	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠	This action is n	on-final.					
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Dispositio	n of Claims							
4)⊠ C 4; 5)⊠ C 6)⊠ C 7)⊠ C	4)  Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.  5)  Claim(s) 11-17 is/are allowed.  6)  Claim(s) 1,3,4 and 18-20 is/are rejected.  7)  Claim(s) 1-10 is/are objected to.							
Applicatio	n Papers	,						
9) <u></u> ⊤I	he specification is objected to by the Exa	miner.						
10)∐ TI	10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
. А	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
	teplacement drawing sheet(s) including the co he oath or declaration is objected to by th	·	• , ,	•	` '			
Priority un	der 35 U.S.C. § 119							
a) 1 2 3	cknowledgment is made of a claim for for All b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority docur Certified copies of the priority docur Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International But	ments have bee ments have bee priority docume ureau (PCT Rul	n received. n received in Applicat ents have been receiv e 17.2(a)).	tion No red in this National	l Stage			
Attachment(s	· ·							
	of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94	8)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D					
3) 🔲 Informa	of Dransperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-940 tition Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/S No(s)/Mail Date		5) Notice of Informal I		O-152)			

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

# Claim Objections

Claim 1 - 10 are objected to because of the following informalities:

In claim 1, lines 8 and 10 recited phrase "a current peak average" and on line 9 the phrase "current gain setting" would be more easily understood if written as "present peak average" and "present gain setting" respectively. The term "current peak average" denotes "peak average at this instant of time" and the term "current gain setting" indicates the present gain setting. The phrase "current" is puzzling because it could mean "present" or "flow of electricity".

Similar scenarios exist in claim 4, line 2, in claim 5 line1, in claim 9, line 2, and in claim 10, line 1.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 6 and 8 recites the limitation "increasing said maximum gain setting" in line 3 and line 3 respectively. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 2, 3 and 7 are objected because of these claims depend on an objected claim.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 18 – 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nelson et al (US Patent 6,058,162).

Regarding claim 18, Nelson et al teach an apparatus for selecting a gain distribution in a subscriber line system having an analog front end 113 having plurality of serially coupled gain stages, an analog-to-digital converter 115 adapted to receive a data signal from said analog front end, and a processor coupled to said analog-to-digital converter and adapted to select a gain setting of each of the gain stages in a predetermined order (see figure 6).

Regarding claim 19, which inherits the limitations of claim 18, Nelson et al teach that the gain stages comprise programmable gain amplifiers (see column 10, lines 30 – 31).

Regarding claim 20, which inherits the limitations of claim 18, Nelson et al further teach that processor comprises a digital signal processor.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2634

Claim 1, 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Halim et al (US Patent 5,036,527).

Regarding claim 1, Halim et al teach an iterative automatic gain control for an analog front end of a modem having an incoming signal is amplified by one of a plurality of predetermines gain levels (selecting the order for gain stages and initializing the gain stages) to provide a received signal, the level of the received signal is detected and information is provided to the signal adjustment controller as to whether the received signal level falls below or exceeds a first and second reference level. In response to this information, the signal adjustment controller provides control signal to the amplifier to maintain the received signal level between the reference levels (see column 4, lines 45 - 55). Also the step of amplifying the incoming signal comprises changing the amplification of the incoming signal to a next higher one of a plurality of predetermined gain levels in response to the control signal being the first stage (see column 6, lines 11 16) and changing the amplification of the incoming signal to a next lower one of the plurality of predetermined gain levels in response to the control signal being the third control state (see column 6, lines 18 - 22). However Halim et al failed to teach to use the gain controller in a digital subscriber line. Since Halim et al's automatic gain control is used in the modem, it would be obvious to an ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention to use the Halim et al's teaching for the gain control in a digital subscriber line system to benefit improved performance because DSL system uses modem in the system.

Regarding clam 3, which inherits the limitations of claim 1, Halim et al teach resetting the gain counter (see column 9, line 50 – 51).

Regarding claim 4, which inherits the limitations of claim 1, Halim et al teach that it takes seven-clock period to set the new gain settings (see column 11 lines 11 - 17).

### Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2 and 5 – 10 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims and overcome the objections stated in the above paragraph.

Claims 11 – 17 are allowable over the prior art of record.

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jaison Joseph whose telephone number is (571) 272-6041. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 - 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Chin can be reached on (571) 272-3056. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 09/966,054

Art Unit: 2634

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jaison Joseph 12/13/2004

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINE!
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Page 6